NATIONAL LIBRARY
CANADA
BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE

Apostolical Succession

AS

Taught by the Roman Catholic Church

AND BY

Many Anglicans

Shewn to Baseless.

By the Rev. R. F. BURNS, D. D.

BV 665
B8

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

A LECTURE.

"Behold how good and pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."—Ps. 133:1,11

PREFATORY NOTE. The Rev. Dr. Burns spent the closing years of his active ministry at Halifax. He was by birth a Scotsman, the son of an eminent Scottish divine, the Rev. Robert Burns, D.D., latterly one of the Professors of Knox College, Toronto. Young Burns early made up his mind to devote his life to the ministry of the gospel. Distinguished as a student, he made his mark at an early stage as a preacher, as a lecturer, as a home missionary and as a pastor. He exercised his ministry with distinction in several congregations, his closing years of active work being spent at Halifax where he had proved himself eminently useful not only in Fort Massey Church and in this city and in the Province of Nova Scotia but in all the sea provinces, and in Ontario and Quebec. Dr. Burns was a sound theologian, profoundly versed in the history of the Church in all its branches, and thoroughly loyal to the glorious Reformation. In the year 1890 the theory of "Apostolical Succession" as held by "High Anglicans and Roman Catholics" received more than usual prominence in this city. Dr. Burns knew the futility of the dogma, its flimsy foundation, its absurd appeal to history, and he treated it in a lecture, in two parts. No reply was attempted, so far as known. In fact, no effective reply can be made to this admirable historical presentation of the case. It has been felt that the Lecture being out of print, is a distinct loss to the student of history who desires to obtain a correct view of the course of events.

Dr. Burns was no lover of controversy, but he welcomed discussion when truth was at stake. He was a large hearted man, totally devoid of the narrow prejudices that too often cloud the mental vision of sectarians. Dr. Burns was a Presbyterian with as generous and broad an outlook as John Calvin himself, who was willing to cross seven seas to promote the union of the Evangelical Churches. He bore no grudge against the Church of England, but greatly admired its reforming founders while he would not hesitate to expose the heresy of Laud and his errant school. R.

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

This forms the basis of the Roman and the Anglo Catholic pretensions. It was elaborately taught some time ago in presence of the collective Anglican Episcopate of Canada, on occasion of the consecration of the coadjutor to the Metropolitan. It has since been the subject of *ex-cathedra* announcements, time and again. It is taken for granted by those Churchmen of the extreme type who look with a sort of mingled pity and contempt on those whom they count "Dissenters." It has been the staple of many a High Church discourse. It is openly stated in the "Trinity" or Dix Catechism, which professes to give the "chief things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health," and which is in use in not a few Anglican Sunday-schools. In this last great authority it is presented thus—pp. 77-81:

Q.—How is the life of the Church preserved? A.—By the Holy Ghost, through the Apostolic Succession of her ministry.

Q.—Does it then make no difference if we belong to some independent Church or sect, and not to a true branch of the Catholic Church? A.—It makes all the difference between obeying and disobeying Christ.

Q.—But did not Christ permit more than one kind of Church government? A.—No, and for 1500 years no one ever tried to prove that he did.

Q.—After 1500 years why did men try to prove this? A.—Having first cut loose from the Church's government, they then set about to justify their course.

Q.—What kind of government did Christ ordain for his Church? A.—Episcopal government.

Q.—Has the Apostolic Order of Bishops ever failed in the Church? A.—No, the Apostolic Succession has never failed.

Q.—Are we sure that it will not fail so long as the world lasts? A.—Yes, for Christ promised this.

Q.—How do we stay in the fellowship of the Apostles? A.—By staying in the fellowship of the Bishops, their successors.

Q.—What has been almost always a mark of the sects that have cut loose from the Apostolic Ministry? A.—First they have denied the Sacraments, then the Apostles' Creed.

It makes us almost feel as if we "did well to be angry" when listening to such outrageous misstatements. They seem to anticipate that this and some of their other misrepresentations might be thought to transgress the limits of charity, and hence they follow it up with the pertinent question: "But is it not uncharitable to speak thus of other religious bodies? A.—No, this is a question of *truth*, not of charity, and it would be uncharitable not to warn them of their danger." In the last answer

"Truth" is put in italics. Yes, verily this is a question of "*Truth.*" It sounds like a grim sarcasm as we plunge through this little book, and see Truth, in a double sense, travestied. A question of Truth, forsooth! and to say it within sight of Sinai and hearing of the ninth Commandment.

This little book goes on to ask: But are not the ministrations of sectarian ministers often blessed? A.—If God blesses those who ignorantly break His rule this does not justify those who knowingly do so.

Q.—But do not some of these sects hold a great deal of Christian truth? A.—Yes, they brought this truth with them from the Catholic Church and have kept it.

Q.—By whom were sects formed? A.—By erring men, not by Jesus Christ.

Q.—Are the sectarian religious bodies also Episcopal? A.—No, they have cut loose from the Bishops of Apostolic Succession.

I might give more extracts, revealing un-Protestant doctrine on other subjects; but these, bearing on the subject of Apostolic Succession, may suffice. Presbyterians are classed with Lutherans and Methodists as among the better class of sectaries. Thanks for the company in which we are put, which we infinitely prefer to that of those who talk, as the Psalmist puts it, "so exceeding proudly," and who revel in "endless genealogies that minister strife rather than godly edifying." But the more we examine this authoritative Catechism, the more do we pity those children, who from Sabbath to Sabbath, receive such a singular decoction.

The consequences of this Apostolic Succession theory are serious and wide-spreading with those who hold it. It is truly the doctrine of "a standing or falling Church." The issue is put thus: "Let there be no assumed Apostolic Succession (in the sense which we reprobate) and then (as we are told) "there may be the loftiest spirituality in the minister, there may be the sublimest piety in the hearers, there may be the most clear and conclusive evidences that the God of the Universe bows the Heavens to own the ministrations of his servant, yet, all is void: there is no genuine Christianity, there are no valid Sacraments, no Ministry, no Church, no Heaven, no Hope, and uncovenanted mercies are the only hope." And, *vice versa*, so greatly is this doctrine prized that if this Succession be present, then, according to Tridentine and Tractarian views, it matters not very much that there may be idolatry in the desk, superstition in the pulpit, and blasphemy upon the altar; if the Succession be there in its integrity, there must be a true Church of Christ, a true Ministry and valid Sacraments. The Church of Rome, because she supposes or is supposed to possess the Apostolic Succession, is "our dear Sister" and "Christ's Holy Home;" the Church of

Scotland, because she is supposed to have it not is "Samaria," that is, not far from the promised Land, but still out of it—and the Dissenters (an epithet most offensive here where there is no Established Church) are summarily consigned, without exception, to the uncovenanted mercies of God.

Eusebius.

Eusebius, of the fourth century, is the Church Historian on whom the advocates of the Apostolic Succession rely for their lists of Bishops. But was Eusebius sure of his own correctness? At the very opening of his History he says: "We are attempting a kind of trackless and unbeaten path. We are totally unable to find even the *bare vestiges* of those who may have travelled the way before us unless, perhaps, what is only presented in the *slight intimations* which some in different ways have transmitted to us in certain *partial narratives* of the times in which they lived who, raising their voices before us, like *torches at a distance*, call out and exhort us where we should walk." The records of the whereabouts of the Apostles themselves are confessed by him to have been derived only from "hearsay and tradition." So partial are these intimations, so faint the light of these torches, that Eusebius has to grope in gloom after the "succession" in the Mother Church at Jerusalem. "We have not ascertained (continues he) in any way that the *times of the Bishops in Jerusalem have been regularly preserved on record, for, tradition* says, they all lived but a very short time."

We know from indubitable evidence that the original church in England was Presbyterian, and that the Anglican was Roman in its origin though purified by Cranmer and the Reformers but polluted again by Laud and the Ritualists. "The Church of England, says Archbishop Whately, in common with all other true Protestant Churches rests the claims of Ministers (and of Ministerial orders) not on some supposed sacramental virtue transmitted from hand to hand in unbroken successions from the Apostles, in a chain of which if any one link be even doubtful, a distressing uncertainty is thrown on all Christian ordinances, sacraments, and Church privileges forever, but on the fact of those Ministers being the regularly appointed officers of a regular Christian community."

Let us here quote the memorable language of Bishop Hoadly, who had filled no fewer than four bishoprics, from 1676 to 1761, who says that "Nothing has so effectually thrown contempt upon a regular succession of the ministry, as the calling no succession regular, but what was uninterrupted, and making the eternal salvation of Christians to depend on that uninterrupted succession, of which the most learned can have the least assurance and the unlearned can have no notion but through ignorance and credulity."

The Reformation Period was the "Golden Age" of the Church of England. Then the divine right of Episcopacy was never thought of, but views prevailed of the liberal kind endorsed in these last days by Simcoe and Hatch, Dean Stanley and Bishop Lightfoot, expressed so emphatically by confessedly the grandest member of the present day Episcopal bench recently deceased; "That the early constitution of the apostolic churches of the first century was not that of a single Bishop but of a body of pastors indifferently styled Bishops or Presbyters, and that it was to the very end of the Apostolic Age that the office which we now call Episcopacy gradually and slowly made its way in the churches of Asia Minor, that Presbytery was not a later growth out of Episcopacy but that Episcopacy was a later growth out of Presbytery, that the office which the Apostles instituted was a kind of rule not of Bishops but of Presbyters and that even down to the third century Presbyters as well as Bishops possessed the power of nominating Bishops."

Even Jerome of the fifth century, author of the Vulgate translation, confessedly the most learned of the Fathers, abandons the divine right of Episcopacy by acknowledging the identity of Presbyters with Bishops. "A presbyter and a bishop says Jerome, commentating on the first chapter of Titus, "are altogether the same and before that by the instigation of the Devil strife arose in the Church and the people began to say some, 'I am of Paul' and some, 'I am of Apollos,' the Church was governed by a Common Council of Presbyters." Jerome in proof of this assertion quotes the very passages admittedly Presbyterian (such as Phil. I, I; Acts 20, 17 to 28; and I Pet. 5, 1, 2.) and then continues, "We have brought forward these things for the purpose of showing that the first Presbyters were the same as Bishops." Jerome's comment on Titus and his famous letter are incorporated with the Canon Law (the statute law of the Papacy), published in three immense folio volumes of 1000 pages. We quote from the 1671 Edition, where the heading of the section is inserted thus, "A presbyter is the same as a bishop and by custom alone do bishops preside over presbyters." Isidore of the seventh century uses Jerome's words, "Among the ancients a bishop and a presbyter are the same, the former being only a title of dignity and the other descriptive of age."

During the Dark Ages these names got mixed and blindness and bigotry were the result. The lust of power got into the ascendant. Discord followed, "See how these Christians love one another," became a withering sarcasm rather than a glowing eulogium. The Reformation introduced a different spirit. It revived the primitive exemplification of our text. Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen, and Continentals

lived in love, though differing in certain phases of their creeds. They endeavored to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

In claiming that the Reformation era was the Golden Age of the Church of England and that the change was wrought by Laud, I need only refer to what Laud's biographer, LeBas, declares. He testifies that when Laud commenced his academic residence (in 1589) Oxford bore a greater resemblance, in many respects, to a colony from Geneva than to a Seminary of Anglo-Catholic Divinity. The genius of Calvin presided in the Schools. The apostolic succession of bishops was treated as little better than a fable. The authority of the church, i. e. Tradition, Councils, and Fathers, was scornfully disregarded. He afterwrds shows (in pages 31-2) that, in the year 1617 matters were in nearly the same Puritanic position and in fact the end and aim of his whole volume is to show that it was entirely owing to Laud that what he terms "Anglo-Catholic" sentiments came to be predominant throughout England. Yet even Archbishop Laud himself, High Churchman though he was and the Father of it, goes not the length of his followers in our day and City. When trying to rescue the Dowager Countess of Buckingham from the toils of the Arch Jesuit Fisher—he uses not Prelatic but as they suited him better, Presbyterians weapons. Fisher quoting Ephesians 4, 11, asserted that Rome had an uninterrupted succession of Bishops from the Apostles and in consequence (just as our Puseyites do now) that she was the true Church. Laud, when it suited his purpose to assume the Presbyterian role, shows convincingly that the true succession, and that for which the Fathers contended, is a succession not of persons but of doctrines. He comes out with what our Archbishop here would do well to mark, learn, and inwardly digest. "It is most certain and apparent to any understanding man that reads antiquity with an impartial eye that a visible continual succession of doctors and pastors have not brought down the Faith unchanged in letter and in sense too from Christ and his Apostles to these days of ours in the Roman Church." Were we to take in the over two centuries since Laud wrote thus we would find Rome changing still more, adding dogma after dogma to her creed, and thus showing incontestably that Infallibility and consequently Immortality cannot belong to her. Archbishop Laud goes further to say,—and we could wish no better argument against Apostolic Succession,—"For succession in the general I shall say this 'Tis a great happiness where it may be admisible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world,—but I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers that makes local, personal, visible and continued succession a neccessary sign or mark of the Church

in any one place." Laud then goes on to prove, which he does conclusively, that the succession is one of doctrine, not of doctors, of principles not persons, and adds in conclusion, "Most evident it is that the succession which the Fathers meant is not tied to place or person but it is tied to the verity of doctrine. Thus under the fire of this father of modern High Churchism the dogma of Apostolic Succession is shattered in pieces. Would that he had stood faithful to the principles that he enunciated when so bravely fighting the Jesuits. But he could change his position like the other when it suited him and so the Golden Age of the Church of England passed away, and was succeeded by an age of Iron, or of iron and clay. Would that that Reformation Golden Age were back again and my text get its old illustration in the cordial fraternizing of these estranged churches. "Behold how good and how pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

The Reformation, after its first upheavings were over, was a reign of peace and purity. No strife did rage nor hostile feuds disturb those peaceful years. During that happy, halcyon Indian Summer all was bright and fair. Episcopalians and Presbyterians lived in love and kept the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. They never looked askance at one another, or counted one another "avowed enemies" or an "organized opposition." All through there is the fullest recognition of one another's ecclesiastical standing. As Professor Fisher puts it "In all these free, unreserved communications, in which the differences among Protestants, as on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, are frequently considered, there is no hint of any trouble, alienation or want of sympathy on account of the difference of the English polity from that of the Continental Churches. The authors are engaged in a common cause, fighting under a common banner, and the question of Episcopacy does not excite a ripple of discontent with one another." Cranmer's favorite project was the banding together of all the Protestant Churches against the common foe, and in this, subsequently, such eminent prelates as Usher, Stillingfleet, Hooker and Hall, indeed all "the giants of those days" thoroughly coincided.

John Knox, Chaplain of Edward VI.

In December, 1551, John Knox, the great Scottish Reformer, was made one of his six chaplains by Edward VI. It shows the liberal spirit of the time in England, that so strict a Presbyterian should have been appointed a Royal chaplain at the English Court, associated with such men as Grindall, afterwards Archbishop of York, and Horne, afterwards Bishop of Winchester. He preaches repeatedly before the King

and Council in London. He takes some part in the Revision of the Liturgy and of what ultimately became the Thirty-nine Articles. His own writings and certain works of the Parker Society tell us of changes which Knox effected in the Episcopal Communion service. In a Conference at Oxford, in 1554, Dr. Weston, the Prolocutor, one of the Ritualists of his day, then a small minority, accuses sturdy, honest Bishop Latimer of complicity with Knox in this purging process. "A renegade Scot (as he calls him) did take away the adoration of Christ in the Sacrament." "So much," continues Weston, "prevailed the authority of that one man at that time."

Thus, in the most friendly way did the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches fraternize in this Reformation era of their history and for long after. What occasioned the change? To the influence of

Archbishop Laud

must it be ascribed. Laud was a narrow-minded bigot. He wished to lead England back to Rome. To facilitate this Romeward move, he would have the Church of England suspend intercourse with foreign Protestant Churches. England's ambassadors on the continent, who used freely to attend the Presbyterian services, were counselled to abstain from doing so for the future. A feeling antagonistic to England, was thus engendered, which boded no good when her day of trouble came.

Bishop Stillingfleet.

Well then might Edward Stillingfleet, made Bishop of Worcester in 1689, who contended against Deists, Catholics, Unitarians and Presbyterians, as well, ask:

Who dare with confidence believe the conjectures of Eusebius at 300 years distance from Apostolic times, when he had no other testimony to vouch but the hypothesis of an uncertain Clement, (certainly not him of Alexandria) and the commentaries of Hegesippus—whose relations and authority are as questionable as many of the reports of Eusebius himself, are, in reference to those older times, for which I need no other testimony than Eusebius, in a place enough of itself to blast the whole credit of antiquity, as to the matter now in debate. For, speaking of Paul and Peter, and the Churches by them planted, and coming to inquire after their successors, he makes this very ingenuous confession: There being so many of them and some naturally rivals, it is not easy to say which of them were counted eligible to govern the Churches established, unless it be those that we may select out of the writings of Paul. Say you so (exclaims Bishop Stillingfleet to Eusebius) is it so hard a

matter to find out who succeeded the Apostles in the Churches planted by them? What becomes then of our unquestionable line of succession? Are all the great outcries of Apostolical tradition, of personal succession, of unquestionable records—resolved at last into the Scripture itself by him from whom all these long pedigrees are fetched? Then let succession know its place and learn to "vail bonnet" to the Scriptures; and withal, let men take heed of overreaching themselves when they would bring down so large a catalogue of single bishops from the first and purest times of the Church, for it will be hard for others to believe them when Eusebius professeth it to be so hard to find them. (Irenicum, pp. 296-7.)

The Roman Succession.

As with the succession at Jerusalem, so at Rome, Episcopalian authorities are entirely at sea. Dr. Cave admits "there is a wonderful and almost irreconcilable discrepancy among later as well as ancient ecclesiastical writers in determining the age and succession only of the first Roman Bishops." Bishop Jewel, writing over three centuries nearer the source than we, says expressly, it can not be done, and, turning the tables on the Jesuit, Harding, with whom he had a controversy and who had questioned the Anglican legitimacy, he says "But wherefore telleth us, M. Harding, this long tale of succession. Have these men (the Papists) their own succession in so safe record? Who was then the Bishop of Rome next by succession unto Peter? Who was the second? Who the third? Who the fourth? Irenaeus reckoneth them together in this order:—Epiphanius, thus—Optatus, thus—Clemens, thus."

Hereby it is clear that of the four first Bishops of Rome M. Harding cannot certainly tell us who in order succeeded other "and thus, talking so much of succession, they are not able to blaze their own succession."

This surely justifies Stillingfleet's calling the Roman succession "muddy as the Tiber itself" and asking the bewildered question, as if Eusebius's "torches" had gone out: "What way shall we find to extricate ourselves out of this labyrinth." Even Laud himself, Father of High Churchism and Episcopal exclusiveness, though he be, goes not the length of his modern representatives, for when pushed by Fisher, the Jesuit, he is constrained to admit: "For succession in the general, I shall say this: it is a great happiness where it may be had, visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find anyone of the ancient Fathers that makes *local, personal, visible and continued succession*, a necessary sign or mark of the Church in any one place." Indeed, extreme though Laud was in many of his views, we are

constrained to coincide with him when he says: "Most evident it is, that the *succession* which the Fathers meant is not tied to place or person, but is tied to *the verity* of doctrine." This is the succession of which the Fathers speak and with which, not Bishops but Presbyters had to do. Hence we are informed by Paul that Timothy was ordained not by the laying on of his hands, or Peter's, or any single member of the Apostolic College, but "by the laying on of the hands of the *Presbutoroi* the *Presbyters* or *Presbytery*."

Thus Irenaeus of the second century says: "Therefore we ought to obey those Presbyters in the Church, who have *succession* as we have shown from the Apostles, who received the certain gift of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father. And again, in the chapter following "Such Presbyters the Church nourishes." Jerome, the translater of the Vulgate, and great Hebrew student among the Fathers, (born A. D. 331, died A. D. 421) goes the length of saying that "Presbyters occupy the place of the Apostles, and *succeed the Apostles*." In full accord with which is Stillingfleet's deduction that it is "the doctrine which they speak of, as to succession, and the persons no further than as they are the *conveyors* of that doctrine.

The Presbyterian Reformers, on coming out from the Church of Rome, had at least the same orders as the Episcopal, while claiming a loftier and purer ancestry. Bucer was a Romish Presbyter before he was a Reformed. So was Farel, who championed Presbyterianism before the Genevan Council, several months before Calvin had reached that beautiful city by the lake, and a year and a half before the publication of his Institutes. Martin Luther was a Romish Presbyter. After his change, many Presbyters were ordained by him who also took part, along with him, in ordaining Amsdorf, Bishop of Nuremberg, and George, Prince of Anhalt, Bishop of Mausbury. Keith the Episcopal historian, testifies the same of our great Scottish Reformer, quoting Wenzel, a Romish Priest as witness, and adds, "Here is a plain and certain instruction that John Knox had formerly received the ordination of a Priest." So that even on this view, as regards the source of their orders, (if there be any virtue in that, which there is not) the two classes of the Reformed were on a par.

Augustine the Monk it elaimed by Anglicans as the father of English orders; of the Scottish too; as a distinguished minister of the Scotch Episcopal Church when asked, " from whom have the present Scotch Bishops derived their orders," replied, "From Augustine, Archbishop of Canterbury through the Anglican Bishops. But Gregory had no jurisdiction within the realm of England. A church existed before the arrival of the Roman delegate at Ethelbert's Court, with Lindhard a Canonical bishop as its pastor—one superior in dignity to Augustine himself—

who was only a presbyter—and equal to Gregory who sent him. The Canons bring out that a Bishop has no power beyond his own diocese so that Gregory's act was an usurpation and wholly irregular, and therefore all the official acts of his representative partook of this irregularity. The words therefore of Gregory in conferring on his envoy "full jurisdiction over the British Bishops," are words to no profit as he had no more right to intrude a Primate on a church than to impose a Prince upon a nation. This contention is endorsed by the great Roman historian Dupin, who thus summarily disposes of the Sovereign Pontiff's baseless pretension:—"This was to give Austin (or Augustine) what he (the Pope) had no power to grant like some successors in that See (of Rome) who very liberally bestowed the Kingdom of England and Ireland upon the King of Spain; and therefore this pretended jurisdiction of the Pope was vigorously opposed by the British Bishops and monks in Austin's time, who refused to receive any Romish custom different from those of their own church, and the right of imposing them has been sufficiently disproved by our writers."

The schism was on Gregory's part in foisting Augustine on an unwilling people, and trying to extrude and supplant the previously existing legitimate Ecclesiastical organization. They from whom the modern Anglicans derived their authority were the real schismatics setting up altar against altar, and the whole Augustinian machinery was a huge irregularity. They were dissenters then in England, just as now Anglicans rank as dissenters in Scotland. Therefore the orders which the Roman delegate pretended to confer and which the English and Scotch Prelatists appeal to as the source of their authority (derived through the Roman channel) can have no foundation to rest on and all they have done since their formation must, on their own principles, be invalid.

Augustine the Monk violated at the start one of the best recognized canons of his own church, that three Bishops are necessary to the consecration of such—except in extreme cases where two might be allowed. He acted alone, for the Bishop he found stoutly opposed him. The legitimate and regular Bishop of the early Primitive British Church would have nothing to do with the Roman intruder, from whom our Reverend friend derives his orders. And so, if either of us are chargeable with the sin of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, it lies rather at his door than at ours—though God forbid that we should be so uncharitable as to charge him with it. The Pope himself felt the force of this fatal objection as the Venerable Bede tells us, and therefore ordered that as soon as his Deputy had ordained a few Prelates he should plant them in adjoining Sees, that in after consecration the full canonical number be present to legitimise the proceedings, or as he expresses it,

"that no ordination of a Bishop be performed without assembling three or four Bishops." But how can the subsequent death of the first wife legalize an act of bigamy? or previous uncanonical proceedings be made authoritative by an after return to canonical obedience? Surely the fundamental error perpetrated by the Papal intruder at the start completely vitiated, rendered uncanonical and invalid, all his after procedure. That illustrious prelate Archbishop Usher demonstrates beyond dispute how incomparably superior in every way the ancient British Church was to the Roman novelty that eventually supplanted it—and how incomparably purer. The newcomers when they failed in argument, true to Rome's logic, had recourse to arms, and true to Rome's character, drunk with the blood of saints, in a single day 1200 of these simple, saintly, original British Presbyters were butchered in cold blood. Yet these ancient Protestants of Brittain, for they did protest then and after against Rome even to the death, appointed their own successors, not Diocesan prelates but simple Presbyters, as the Venerable Bede admits. Archbishop Usher in his "Religion of the Ancient Irish," page 618, by reference to the earliest and most authentic authorities has demonstrated that nearly the whole of Saxon England was converted by our own Scotch missionaries Ardan, Finan and Colman and their brethren. The characters of these our primitive Presbyters may be estimated from the reverence with which they inspired even their adversaries and from the singular fact that Rome, which they so strenuously and successfully opposed, availed herself of that reverence with which the people cherished their memories, and to increase her own power after their death actually canonized them as British Saints, placed their names in her calendar and set apart shrines for their worship and holidays for their commemoration. And as to their subjection to Rome, our Scottish, British, and Irish Primitive Churches refused even to hold communion with Augustine, denounced him as a heretic, and excommunicated him as a schismatic. All this is most ingenuously acknowledged even by Bede himself. The highest authorities thus, even those favorable to Romanism and Anglicanism, reveal to us the origin of the Korah band and make us glad that we have no fellowship with such unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reproved them for preferring to this bastard parentage and progeny, connection with those original British Presbyters who made Ireland the Island of the Saints and England and Scotland Goshens with light in their dwellings, heralding the later Reformation period when the people whom Rome made in the dreary interval to sit in darkness saw a great light. To this great light let us come more determined than ever to

show forth whereto we have already attained. Let us hold by the fundamentals and be more bent on a real connection with Christ than a fancied succession from the Apostles. Let the matters on which we disagree, confessedly minor, retire to the rear and those on which we agree, which are the main matters, be brought by us more to the front, remembering the advice of one who says, "Put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit."

Breaks in the Chain.

What constant breaks in the chain of this boasted Apostolic Succession! For example, eight married men, unordained, not admitted even to the order of Deacons, were advanced to the Primacy of Ireland. In Scotland, the interruptions were so frequent that in the 19th Article of their Confession, the Scottish Episcopalians prudently deny "lineal descent," to be "a mark of the *true Kirk*." Archbishop Sharpe consecrated George Haliburton, Murdock Mackenzie, David Strachan, John Patterson and Robert Wallace to the Sees of Dunkeld, Moray, Brechin, Ross and the Isles, though all of them, save Mackenzie, had only Presbyterian Baptism and Orders, and none of them had been Deacons or Presbyters previously.

These irregulars from the Fathers of the present Scottish Episcopal Church. The electric current (ecclesiastically), for whose uninterrupted transmission a certain Episcopal Bishop contends, suffered this irreparable interruption. Bishop Walker, of Edinburgh, informs us that Waddell, Archdeacon of St. Andrews, was a Presbyterian minister before the Restoration. He readily conformed to the Episcopal Church but he *would not submit* to be Episcopally ordained. "Well, with all the bigotry with which our poor Church has, at every period been accused, his *scruples* and the *scruples of many* in similar circumstances," adds the Bishop, "were respected and his clerical character was recognized without that Episcopal ordination which, by Episcopalians universally, is considered as essential." This was the common way to admit to the corresponding status on a simple declaration without re-baptizing or re-ordaining. "No Bishop in Scotland (says the well-known Bishop Burnett) during his stay in that Kingdom ever did so much as desire any of the Presbyters (*i. e.* Presbyterian ministers,) to be re-ordained." A similar course was followed by Cranmer in the reception of foreign Presbyterian Ministers to the Church of England. Lists of Bishops are given without any evidence of the regularity of their baptism or ordination. Several of them have been shown to be no Bishops at all.

In 1610, James I. appointed John Spotteswood, Andrew Lamb and Gavin Hamilton, who had been parish ministers of Calder, Burntisland and Hamilton respectively, to the Bishoprics of Glasgow, Brechin and Galloway, though they were not re-baptized or re-ordained. Nor had they to pass (as canon law requires) through the intermediate stages of Deacon and Presbyter *but per saltum, vaulted* into the Episcopate. On the High Church theory we are considering, their baptism and ordination being irregular, all their acts become invalid.

Butler and Secker.

Bishop Butler, one of the most illustrious of Episcopal prelates, author of the immortal Analogy, was originally a Presbyterian. His friend and companion, Secker, who became Archbishop of Canterbury, was the son of a Presbyterian minister. Neither of them was baptized, an omission calculated, on this High Church theory, to vitiate all their official acts. And be it remembered, Secker officiated at the funeral of George II, the baptism, marriage and coronation of George III., and the baptism of George IV. It is worth noticing in this connection, that Charles I., whose memory High Churchmen revere as the Royal Martyr, was baptized by David Lindsay, a Presbyterian minister, in the Chapel Royal, at Dunfermline on the 23rd December, 1600—nor was he ever re-baptized—a full recognition again of Presbyterian orders.

The Earl of Clarendon, the great statesman and historian once Lord High Chancellor of England, father-in-law of James II. and grandfather of Queens Mary and Anne, in his history of the Civil War says:—"In all former times the ambassadors, and all foreign ministers of state, employed from England into any parts where the Reformed religion was exercised, frequented their Churches, gave all possible countenance to their profession, and held correspondence with the most active and powerful persons of that relation. And especially the ambassador at Paris from the time of the Reformation, had diligently and constantly attended the Church at Charenton, where Claude, Daillie and other famous Presbyterians ministered." The solemn spirituality and severe simplicity of Presbyterianism did not suit the cravers after a sensuous, sensational service. "Some instructions were given to the ambassadors to 'forbear any extraordinary commerce with that tribe.'" Clarendon informs us further that the English ambassador, Lord Scudamore, caused to be fitted up in his own house a chapel after the extremest Ritualistic model, and took pains to say that "the Church of England looked not on the Huguenots as a part of

their communion," which, Clarendon continues, was "too much and too industriously discussed at home." These discussions helped to widen the breach between the two classes, and to hasten on the catastrophe in which both Prince and Prelate, Church and State, became involved.

Hallam Confirms Clarendon.

In his Constitutional History of England we find Hallam writing thus:

"The system pursued by Bancroft and his imitators, Bishops Neville and Laud, with the approbation of the king, was opposed to the healing counsels of Burleigh and Bacon, and was just such as low-born and little-minded men, raised to power by fortune's caprice, are ever found to pursue. * * * They began by preaching the Divine Right, as it is called, or absolute indispensability of Episcopacy; a doctrine of which the first traces, as I apprehend, are found about the end of Elizabeth's reign. They insisted on the necessity of Episcopal succession regularly derived from the Apostles. They drew an inference from this tenet, that ordination by Presbyters was in all cases null. And as this affected all the Reformed Churches in Europe except their own, the Lutherans not having preserved the succession of their bishops, while the Calvinists had altogether abolished that order, they began to speak of them not as brethren of the same faith, united by the same cause, and distinguished only by differences little more than those of political commonwealths (which had been the language of the Church of England ever since the Reformation) but as aliens to whom they were not at all related, and schismatics with whom they held no communion—nay, as wanting the very essence of a Christian society. This again brought them nearer by irresistible consequence, to the Disciples of Rome, whom, with becoming charity, but against the received creed of the Puritans and perhaps against their own Articles, they all acknowledged to be a part of the Catholic Church while they were withholding that appellation expressly or by inference from Heidelberg and Geneva."

In a note to this passage, Mr. Hallam adds:—

"Lord Bacon in his advertisement, respecting the controversies of the Church of England, written under Elizabeth, speaks of the notion as newly broached. Yea, and some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the Churches abroad; and that so far as some of our men ordained in foreign parts have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers."

In his History of England (vol. I, page 382) Lord Macaulay writes thus:—

"The founders of the Anglican Church had retained Episcopacy as an ancient, a decent, and a convenient ecclesiastical polity, but had not declared that form of Church Government to be of Divine institution. We have already seen how low an estimate Cranmer had formed of the office of a Bishop. In the reign of Elizabeth, Jewel, Cooper, Whitgift and other eminent doctors defended prelacy, as innocent, as useful, as what the State might lawfully establish, as what, when established by the State, was entitled to the respect of every citizen. But they never denied that a Christian community without a Bishop might be a pure Church. On the contrary, they regarded the Protestants of the Continent as of the same household of faith with themselves. An English Churchman, nay, even an English Prelate, if he went to Holland, conformed without scruple to the established religion of Holland.

"In the year 1603, the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury solemnly recognized the Church of Scotland, a church in which Episcopal control and Episcopal ordination were then unknown, as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. It was even held that Presbyterian ministers were entitled to place and voice in Æcumenical Councils."

Macaulay further notes the fact I have already mentioned that when the States General of the United Provinces convoked at Dort a Synod of Doctors not episcopally ordained, an English Bishop and an English Dean, commissioned by the head of the English Church, sat with those Doctors, preached to them and voted with them on the gravest questions of Theology. Nay, many English benefices were held by divines who had been admitted to the ministry in the Calvinistic form used on the Continent, nor was re-ordination by a Bishop in such cases then thought necessary or even lawful.

The testimonies of the most eminent divines of the Church of England are in fullest harmony with those of the two great historians, Hallam and Macaulay.

We have traced the origin of modern High Churchism to Archbishop 'Laud—who was supreme in church and state under Charles I, becoming Prime Minister after Buckingham's death, and who, to carry out his favorite scheme of uniting the three kingdoms under one form of religion of which he should be head, drew up a Liturgy which he wished to enforce on all dependents. Our Scottish forefathers withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed. To them our Empire owes an inestimable debt of gratitude for their heroic resistance.

We saw that during the first three centuries it was never mooted, and that although Eusebius in the fourth century

is the authority on whom the advocates of the apostolic succession rely for their lists of bishops, he has not the slightest confidence in their accuracy, and gropes in gloom after the succession even in the Mother Church in Jerusalem. "We have not ascertained in any way (he says) that the times of the bishops in Jerusalem have been regularly preserved on record, for Tradition says that they all lived but a short time. The great Bishop Stillingfleet in 1689 says to the pretentious High Churchmen of his day who boasted of large catalogues of single Bishops, "It will be hard for others to believe them when Eusebius professeth it to be so hard to find them." With reference to Rome, Dr. Cave, Bishop Jewel, and others bring out an "irreconcilable discrepancy among later as well as ancient ecclesiastical writers in determining the age and succession only of the first Roman Bishops."

We saw the constant breaks in the chain of this so called succession. Eight married men unordained—not admitted even to the order of deacons, were advanced to the primacy of Ireland. In Scotland Archbishop Sharpe, himself an irregular, made five Bishops of men who had received Presbyterian baptism and orders and who previously had never been deacons or presbyters, and these are the Fathers of the present Scotch Episcopal Church. Bishop Burnet asserts that no bishop in Scotland during his stay in that Kingdom ever breathed the idea of re-ordaining any of the Presbyterian ministers when they joined the Episcopal Church. Bishop Butler, author of the immortal Analogy, and his friend Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury, were Presbyterians and never re-baptized, and there is not a tittle of evidence that Tillotson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, originally a Baptist, was ever baptized at all. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, says of Tillotson, "that there was so much mystery and uncertainty (even in the memory of persons living in his day) prevailing as to when, where, and by whom he had been ordained, that doubts existed in the minds of many persons as to whether he had been ordained."

The English Reformers did not contend for any system of Government or discipline in the Church as being *jure divino*. Nor did they refuse to recognize the validity of ordination in those foreign Churches that had renounced Episcopacy.

Referring to the reign of Elizabeth, this distinguished Anglican declares:

"The question of Church Government was vehemently agitated during this period. The Reformers were agreed that no precise form was laid down in the New Testament; but when the Puritans became divided into two parties the Presbyterian party advocated the Divine right of their system. Cranmer and all the Reformers asserted that the form of Government was left to the civil magistrate to determine according to times

and circumstances. The Prelates of this reign (i. e. Queen Elizabeth's) maintained the same views. They did not consider any mode of government essential to the constitution of the Church. Hence the validity of ordination, as exercised in those Reformed Churches where Episcopacy was not retained was admitted. By an act passed in the thirteenth year of this reign, the ordinations of foreign reformed Churches were declared valid. Many who had received Presbyterian ordination abroad were allowed to exercise their ministry in the Church of England, provided they conformed. Travers, Whittingham, Cartwright and many others had received no other, and their ordination was never questioned. At a subsequent period, this practise was denounced.

Lathbury finds the germ of the High Church idea in Laud, and indicates that even Bancroft did not go his length as regards the Presbyterians, the regularity of whose ecclesiastical standing he was not prepared to dispute. Laud's notions on the subject of Church Government were at variance with those adopted by many of his predecessors, who, until the time of Bancroft, never claimed a Divine right for the Government of the English Church, and even Bancroft admitted the validity of the Presbyterian ordination, for, when it was suggested in 1610 that the Scottish Bishops elect should be ordained Presbyters, he opposed, on the ground that ordination by Presbyters was valid.

Keble, whose hymns are classic, and whose holy, humble, spirit we cannot but admire, strong though his ritualistic liking and great his leaning toward that rising mediæval school of thought which his name helped to further—Keble, with characteristic concientiousness, in the preface to his edition of the works of the great Hooker, makes this frank admission:

"It might have been expected that the defenders of the English Hierarchy against the first Puritans, should take the highest ground, and challenge for the Bishops the same unreserved submission, on the same plea of exclusive Apostolic prerogative, which their adversaries feared not to insist on for their Elders and Deacons. It is notorious, however, that such was not, in general, the line preferred by Jewell, Whitgift, Bishop Cooper and others to whom the management of this controversy was entrusted during the early part of Elizabeth's reign. * * * It is enough with them to show that the government by Archbishops and Bishops is ancient and allowable. They never venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the Succession with the validity of the Holy Sacraments. And yet it is obvious (and here the High Church proclivities of the amiable Keble crop out, making his frank admission of the opposite view of the Reformers all the stronger) it is obvious that such a course of argument alone (supposing

it to be borne out by facts) could fully meet all the exigencies of the case."

A single witness from the Broad School will complete our circle of testimony from Anglican sources. What more fitting representative than Dean Stanley, who, whatever may be said of his laxity on certain points of doctrine, is universally acknowledged to be an accurate historian and thoroughly truthful man. In his lectures on the Church of Scotland, he says:

"The sentiment toward Presbyterian Churches was far more generous and comprehensive in the century which followed the Reformation than it was in that which followed the Restoration. The English Articles are so expressed as to include the recognition of Presbyterian ministers.

"The first English Act of Uniformity was passed with the express view of securing their services to the English Church. The first English Reformers and the statesmen of Elizabeth, would have been astonished at any claim of exclusive sanctity for the Episcopal order.* * * The Canons of the English Convocation enjoin that prayers are to be offered up for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christians dispersed throughout the world, especially for the Churches of England, Scotland and Ireland. There can be no doubt that the framers of this have meant to acknowledge the Northern ecclesiastical establishment, at that time Presbyterian, as a Christian Church. With the exception of the Roman Catholics, it was the only Christian communion then existing in Scotland, and questions regarding any other state of matters than that actually before them could not have occurred to the Convocation. It is this also which is recognized in the most solemn form in the British Constitution. The very first declaration which the Sovereign makes, *taking precedence even of the recognition of the rights and liberties of the English Church and nation*, which is postponed till the Day of Coronation, is that in which, on the day of the Accession, the Sovereign declares that he or she will maintain inviolate and intact the Church of Scotland. In the Act of Union itself which prescribes this Declaration, the same securities are exacted throughout for the Church of Scotland as were exacted for the Church of England, and it is on record that when the Act was passed, and some questions arose among the Peers as to the propriety of so complete a recognition of the Presbyterian Church, the then Primate of all England, 'the old Rock,' as he was called, Archbishop Tennison, rose, and said with a weight which carried all objections before it—'*The narrow notions of all Churches have been their ruin.* I believe that the Church of Scotland, though not as perfect as ours, is as true a Protestant Church as the Church of England.'"

Such was the spirit of the Church of England at the Reformation, the most glorious period of her history, and for a century thereafter. "Minding not high things;" making not any high-sounding pretensions, claiming no superiority in the matter of orders; allying herself lovingly with the other churches of the Reformation, and finding a mouthpiece for the outbreathings of a soul truly Catholic and Apostolic, in good Bishop Hall, when he wrote "We do love and honor those our sister Churches, as the dear spouse of Christ, and give zealous testimonies of our well-wishing to them."

This bright Indian Summer was followed by a gloomy Winter, during which these hopeful blossoms were nipped, and a freezing formalism prevailed. The Diotrephes spirit of Laud was in the ascendant, and although in the days of the Commonwealth it received a terrible check, and was taught the severest lessons, yet, with the return of Charles II. to the throne his father had left for the scaffold the old sacerdotal spirit revived, culminating and becoming crystallized in 1662 in the Act of Uniformity, which made "Episcopal consecration or ordination" essential, as a prerequisite to the ministry; thus reversing the entire policy of the Reformers, and isolating the English Church from all the other Churches of the Reformation. This baneful blunder of the Stuart faction that wrought so much misery for our empire in other ways, has been perpetuated, though at the Revolution of 1688, Archbishop Tillotson, the Primate of England, (whom there is every reason to believe was not episcopally ordained or even baptized) made an honest effort to end this state of isolation by making certain concessions, prominent amongst which was this: "that for the future, those who have been ordained in any of the Reformed Churches, be not required to be re-ordained here, to render them capable of preferment in this Church." Tillotson's well-interposed effort failed, and the Restoration reversal of the Reformation procedure is yet in force. It does indeed seem passing strange that any popish priest, on his simply declaring himself, on whatever grounds, a Protestant, may at once be received into the Communion of the Church of England without being re-ordained; while that privilege, if they had desired it, would not have been granted to Dr. Chalmers, or Guthrie, or McLeod, or Hodge, to R. M. McCheyene or Duff, Angell James, D'Aubigne, or Adolphe Monod, David Livingstone or Robert Hall. It gives a shock to every conviction of the conscience or sense of propriety that in such a professedly Protestant Church such great and good men should be thus humiliated, as to have their orders discarded, while the official standing of any one coming from Rome would be respected. Is this true Protestantism? Is it ordinary courtesy? It matters nothing to the excluded but to the excluder much.

Was Arch. Tillotson Baptized or Ordained at All?

Another Primate of England, even better known than Secker, Archbishop Tillotson, was the son of a Baptist minister, and never *baptized at all*, by layman or minister, Presbyterian or Episcopal. Though often challenged to furnish proof of his baptism, none was furnished. Nor did he ever pass the first step in the graduating scale, that of Deacon, and when he received Priest's Orders it was from a Scotchman, Sydisorf, whose own Orders were invalid. It is to Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, that Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, when he says: "Even in the memory of persons living there existed a Bishop concerning whom there was so much mystery and uncertainty prevailing as to when, where and by whom he had been ordained, that doubts existed in the minds of many persons whether he had ever been ordained at all."

In "Percival's Catalogue" occur the names of fourteen Bishops in England, including Pearson, of Chester, author of the well-known work on the Creed, of whose consecration to their office no record exists. Consequently, *no man who has received orders through any of these has or can have any evidence that he is in Orders at all.*

How foolish then it is to talk of an unbroken Apostolic Succession when we have so many infallible proofs that no such succession exists, or ever existed, and that the published catalogues have such constant breaks and such spurious links as to make them utterly unreliable.

Romeward in its Tendency.

How inconsistent for a Protestant Church to claim descent through a papal channel! along a line crooked as it is corrupt. Well might Bishop Latimer say. "What fellowship hath Christ with Antichrist. Therefore it is not lawful to bear the yoke with Papists." While Bishop Jewel adds, in the true spirit of the Reformation: "As for us, we have forsaken a Church in which we could neither hear the pure Word of God nor administer the Sacraments nor invoke the the name of God as we ought."

How many missing links! Amid the numerous corruptions of doctrine and practice and gross superstition that crept in during these ages we find recorded descriptions not only of the profound ignorance and profligacy of life of many of the clergy, but also of the grossest irregularities in respect of discipline and form. We read of Bishops consecrated when mere children, of men officiating who barely knew their elders, of prelates expelled, of others put into their places by

violence; of illiterate and profligate laymen and habitual drunkards admitted to holy orders, and in short, of the prevalence of every kind of disorder. It is inconceivable that any one even moderately acquainted with History, can feel a certainty or any approach to certainty, that amid all this confusion and corruption every requisite form was in every case adhered to by men, many of them profane and secular, unrestrained by public opinion through the gross ignorance of the population among whom they lived—and that no one not duly consecrated or ordained was admitted to sacred offices.

Archbishop Whately shows most unanswerably that if a single link of the chain be faulty, everything canonical must on High Church principles be utterly nullified ever after in respect to all the links that hang on that one. For if a Bishop has not been duly consecrated or had not been previously rightly ordained his ordinations are null and so are the ministrations of those ordained by him and their ordination of others, and so on without end. The poisonous taint of informality if it once creep in undetected will spread the infection of nullity of orders to an indefinite and irremediable extent. He then proceeds thus, "Who can undertake to pronounce that during that long period usually designated as the Dark Ages no such taint ever was introduced? Irregularities could not be excluded without a perpetual miracle and that no such miraculous interference existed we have historical proof."

How different this view from that which now prevails in the Colonial as well as American Episcopal Churches, and which found expression by Bishop Doane before the collected Episcopate, at Fredericton: "There is no break in the golden chain, no split in the close mesh. We have an Apostolic ministry coming to us in an unbroken line from Apostolic days." After the indubitable evidence we have adduced, endorsed so fully by the very highest Episcopal authorities, we can, ourselves, determine how utterly fallacious these High Church testimonies are, but that, while wide as the poles assunder from them, we are in perfect accord with the prevalent Church of England sentiment of an earlier and purer era, the essence of whose witness-bearing is voiced by Bishop Hoadly (born 1676, died 1761), who filled four Bishoprics, Bangor, Hereford, Salisbury and Winchester, when he says:

"Nothing has so effectually thrown contempt upon a regular succession of the ministry, as the calling no succession regular, but what was uninterrupted and making the eternal salvation of Christians to depend on that uninterrupted succession, of which the most learned can have the least assur-

ance and the unlearned can have no notion but through ignorance and credulity."

Why then return to those weak and beggarly elements whereunto they were in bondage, going back again to the Egypt whence so grand an exodus had been obtained, instead of making a "new departure," and standing fast in that liberty wherewith Christ had made them free? It is not one of the least objections to this whole dogma of Apostolic Succession, that it is Romeward in its tendency.

The True Succession.

What we contend for is not a succession of persons, but of principles, not a succession of individuals along a particular ecclesiastical line, whose direct lineal descent from the Apostles never has been proven, nor can be by any reason of constant interruptions at sundry times and in divers manners, but, "a succession of divine truth transmitted from the Apostles in the imperishable record of scripture, a succession of Divine ordinances, the preaching of the Word, the administration of Sacraments and the exercise of discipline which have their warrant in the Word, and have been observed with greater or less purity from the Apostolic age till now; the succession of the Church, the Body of Christ, the society of the faithful, including all who call on the name of the Lord and have been gathered into the one common fold, "both theirs and ours;" the ministerial succession, or the standing ministry of the gospel, for the edifying of the body of Christ receiving their message from the Word, their Mission from Christ, their inward call from the Spirit, their outward call from the Church.

It is in regard to this last—the *ministerial succession*—that the whole High Church party in the Church of England err, falling into the fallacy which Archbishop Whately in his "Kingdom of Christ," so conclusively exposes—the fallacy "which consists in confounding together the unbroken Apostolic succession of a *Christian Ministry generally*, and the same succession in an unbroken line of *this or that individual minister*." "If each man's Christian hope (argues the Irish Prelate), is made to rest on his receiving the Christian ordinances at the hands of a minister to whom the sacramental virtue, that gives efficacy to those ordinances, has been transmitted, in unbroken succession, from hand to hand, everything must depend on that *particular* minister, and his claim is by no means established from our merely establishing the uninterrupted existence of such a *class of men as Christian ministers*." "The Church of England," continues the Archbishop—bringing out the Reformation as distinguished from

the Restoration, the Cranmer and Ridley view as distinguished from the Laud and Bancroft view—"the Church of England (in common with all other Protestant churches) rests the claim of ministers, not on some supposed sacramental virtue, transmitted, from hand to hand, in unbroken succession from the Apostles, in a chain of which, if any one link be even doubtful, a distressing uncertainty is thrown on all Christian ordinances, sacraments and Church privileges for ever, but on the fact of *those ministers* being the *regularly appointed officers of a regular Christian community.*"

There was a time, the true Golden Age of the Church of England, when it was far otherwise, when she fraternized most closely and cordially with other Churches, notably the Presbyterian. Then she shone forth "fair as the moon" in purity of character, "clear as the sun" in her exhibitions of sound doctrine, and in her faithful witness-bearing against all laxity of principle and practice, and her aggressive power against a world lying in wickedness, "terrible as an army with banners."

For generations the Church of England was in heartiest sympathy with the other Protestant Churches of Europe, which were mainly Presbyterian. Read the writings of that illustrious "quaternion" of Prelates, Cranmer, Parker, Grindal and Whitgift, the first four Protestant Archbishops of Canterbury, and you will not find a grain of the leaven of High Churchism. The "Zurich Letters" published under the auspices of the Parker (a Church of England) Society, embrace the era from the establishment of Protestantism in England till the death of Queen Elizabeth. These letters passed between Cranmer, Corndale, Grindal, Fox, Hooper, Cox, Jewel and the like Episcopalians in England, and Calvin, Melancthon, Bucer, Bullinger, Martyn and the like Presbyterians on the Continent, and breathe a most fraternal spirit. Though differing on the matter of Church Government, they never thought of questioning the orders of their brethren of other Churches. Presbyterian professors were repeatedly appointed in Oxford and Cambridge to educate the English clergy. Presbyterian ministers were settled over English parishes "by virtue only (as Bishop Hall attests) of *that ordination* which they have *brought with them* from other Reformed Churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings without any exception against the lawfulness of their calling." Hall, when Dean, along with a Bishop, sat as the English Commissioners at the Synod of Dort, which was well-nigh altogether Presbyterian. Gillespie, Rutherford, Baillie and others formed the delegates from the Scotch Presbyterian Church in that great Westminster Assembly, which was mainly Episcopalian.

The Standards of the Church of England were repeatedly subjected to Presbyterian review. Bishop Jeremy Taylor declares that in the framing of the Liturgy, the English Reformers "joined to their own star all the shining tapers of the other Reformed Churches, calling for the advice of the eminently learned and zealous Reformers, in other Kingdoms, that the light of all together might show them a clear path to walk in." The Book of Common Prayer was largely copied from the "Liturgy of Cologne," which was the work of Melancthon and Bucer (one of Calvin's disciples) and all of them good sound Presbyterians. "From this Liturgy" (says Archbishop Lawrence in his Bampton Lectures) "our offices bear evident marks of having been freely borrowed, liberally imitating, but not servilely copying it."

One might surely have expected (to use the words of another) that in coming to a new country where there is no Established Church and where there are no civil obligations in the way, the members of the Church of England would have sought out the old paths and returned to their noble Reformation traditions, recognizing the sisterhood of the Churches, and thus showing themselves, while not the less Church of England, the more Protestant and in the true sense, Catholic. Other Churches in Canada have acted in this spirit, forgetting old contests which still separate brethren at home and levelling the barriers which partisan feeling had erected. We trust that ere long, beloved brethren in the Church of England will follow the example, and abandoning a seclusion which is not recognized by her Constitution, and was forced on the parent Church in the servile days of the Stuarts, will resume the place of the Fathers by the side of the sister Churches of the Reformation.